

REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Examiner's Action dated 2 June 2005.

As a preliminary note, in the Action, Applicants see no paragraph 6, two paragraph 8's and no paragraph 10. Have any paragraphs been left out?

Applicants have amended claim 1 with reactive compounds including those in claims 10-11.

The claims have been amended to recite reactive compounds that are used to trap volatile organic carbonyl compounds in the printing technology of the invention. Support for the Amendment is found throughout the specification and in the claims as filed. In paragraphs 1 through 5, the Examiner rejects certain claims under 35 U.S.C. §112. Applicants have also amended the claims in this regard. No new matter is introduced by this amendment. These amendments are formal in nature and should not be used to limit the scope of the claims.

Regarding the Examiner's comment in paragraph 3, Applicants have specifically recited the presence of a printable layer and refer to it. The Examiner's comments about "a printable layer" is not a positive recitation is not understood. The claim clearly states that the printable layer is formed on the exterior of the substrate layer. The specification provides support and discussion about the nature and scope of printable layers (page 16, line 6 to page 17, line 9). There can be no indefiniteness in this regard.

In paragraph 4, the Examiner comments about the location of the reactive compound. The reactive compound can be placed in any of the layers or in all the layers, it is simply there to react with and trap volatile carbonyl compounds. As such, its location is not critical and can be placed in any or all layers of the structure.

In paragraph 5, the Examiner comments regarding the term "the packaging layer". The claim as filed recites packaging material in the preamble.

Applicants assert that all considerations regarding 35 U.S.C. §112 are now moot.

The Examiner should note that there is no paragraph 6 in the letter.

The Examiner, in paragraphs 7 through 8, has rejected claims 1-8, 17-19, 33-34, 36-37 and 44-45 under a judicially created obviousness-type double patenting rejection over Wood et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,985,772, and in view of Pennaz, U.S. Patent No. 5,382,282. Since neither of these references teach the reactive compounds of the claims of the invention, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Examiner has, in duplicate paragraph 8, and paragraphs 9 -11 (note there is no paragraph 10 in the Action), rejected claims 1-8, 17-19, 33-34, 36-37 and 44-45 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Wood et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,985,772 in view of Pennaz, U.S. Patent No. 5,382,282. On page 5, line 12, Applicants assume that the Examiner refers to U.S. Patent No. 5,985,772. Again, since neither reference teaches the claimed reactive compounds, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. These rejections will be treated together for efficiency purpose.

The claims as amended relate to a set of reactive compounds in packaging layers that react with volatile compounds to trap and prevent their release. Wood et al. discusses the use of a substituted cyclodextrin material in a thermoplastic layer to act as a barrier compound in thermoplastic resins and coatings. The cyclodextrin material is not a reactive material, but simply absorbs relatively more polar compounds within the central pore of the cyclodextrin molecule. This is purely a physical association of a polar material in the internal pore location of the molecule where it is thermodynamically stable upon absorption. There is no covalent bonding that occurs between the polar compounds and the cyclodextrin molecule.

The claimed invention relates to a set of reactive compounds to trap carbonyl compounds. This is quite different than that shown in Wood et al. reference. Wood et al. disclose a physical absorption of a molecule within a cyclodextrin structure while the claims recite a specific range of highly reactive compounds that can react with and trap carbonyl compounds within the printing layer. These reactive bisulfite, hydrazide, hydrazine, trazinc, triazole, imidazole, or semicarbazide compounds are nowhere taught in Wood et al. and the use of these compounds in the printing layer is not obvious. First, the printing layers are different than the thermoplastic materials and coating layers of the Wood et al. invention. The materials are made in different manners and obtain different reactive properties.

Pennaz adds nothing to this rejection and apparently is simply cited to show that in printing processes, the use of printing inks leave printed residues on printable substrates. Pennaz teaches neither a reactive compound nor the trapping of any volatile carbonyl compounds within the layer.

In the Examiner's paragraph 12, the Examiner asserts that claims 10-16 and 38-43 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants thank the Examiner for this indication

and have amended the claims to recite specific reactive compounds that are patentable over the cited art.

In summary, no Terminal Disclaimer is required for obtaining an allowance of the amended claims and the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection has been overcome by the amendments to

the claims. If the Examiner believes a telephone interview in this case would be helpful, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the number shown below.

Respectfully submitted,

31 Aug 2005
Date

Mark DiPietro
Mark DiPietro
Reg. No. 28,707
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
Telephone: (612) 371-5375
E-mail: mdipietro@merchant-gould.com

K:\clients\11\1181651USD2P-Amendment2.doc

23552

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE